



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/632,897	08/07/2000	David T. Chang	M-9251US	2953

24251 7590 09/17/2003

SKJERVEN MORRILL LLP
25 METRO DRIVE
SUITE 700
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

BURGESS, BARBARA N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/632,897

Applicant(s)

CHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Barbara N Burgess

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3, 7-21, 26- 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pintsov.

As per claim 1, 17, 21, 29, Pintsov discloses a method for customizing a structured document for delivery to an Internet appliance, comprising:

- Identifying information units in said structured document (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24);
- Selecting one or more of said information units for delivery (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24);
- Creating in a database a second structured document including said one or more of said information units (column 3, lines 19-22); and
- Delivering said second structured document to said Internet appliance (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24).

As per claim 3, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 1, further comprising creating a menu including said information units, said menu being adapted for selection by a user and being presented to said user on a graphical display (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24).

As per claim 7, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 1, further comprising, prior to said identifying, specifying said structured document from by a uniform resource locator (URL) (column 3, lines 19-22).

As per claims 8, 26, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 1, further comprising, prior to said identifying, selecting said structured document from a list of bookmarks (column 3, lines 19-22).

As per claim 9, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 1, wherein said Internet appliance includes means for determining the Internet appliance's geographical location (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24).

As per claim 10, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 9, further comprising including in said second document pre-configured resources (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24).

As per claim 11, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 10, wherein said pre-configured resources comprises location-specific information (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24).

As per claim 12, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 10, wherein said pre-configured resources are updated at specified time intervals (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24).

As per claim 13, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 1, wherein said second document is adapted for display on said internet appliance in accordance with a profile of said internet appliance (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24).

As per claim 14, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 13, further comprising, prior to said selecting, creating said profile of said Internet appliance (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24).

As per claim 15, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 1, further comprising, prior to said delivery, presenting on said internet appliance a menu for selection, said menu including as a selection item a bookmark representing said second structured document (column 3, lines 19-22).

As per claims 16, 27, Pintsov discloses a method as in Claim 1, wherein said second structured document is associated in said database with a specified user (column 3, lines 35-39, column 4, lines 30-34, column 4, lines 49-53, column 5, lines 15-24).

As per claim 18, Pintsov discloses a database as in Claims 17, further comprising a channel record associated with said user client record, said channel representing a pre-configured resource (column 3, lines 19-22).

As per claim 19, 28, Pintsov discloses a database as in Claim 17, further comprising a site record associated with said user client record, said site record representing a specified resource (column 3, lines 19-22).

As per claims 20, 30-32 Pintsov discloses a database as in Claim 19, further comprises a customization record associated with said site record, said customization record representing modification of said resource in accordance with said device profile record (column 3, lines 19-22).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2157

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pintsov in view of Balabanovic.

As per claim 2, Pintsov does not explicitly disclose a method as in Claim 1, wherein said second structured document comprises an XML document. However, the use and advantages for using such document is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Balabanovic (column 10, lines 5-25).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate sending an XML document in Pintsov's method in order to create, view, and play the message.

5. Claims 4, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pintsov in view of

As per claim 4, 24, Pintsov does not explicitly disclose a method as in Claim 1, wherein said Internet appliance comprises a mobile telephone. However, the use and advantages for using a mobile phone is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at

Art Unit: 2157

the time the invention was made as evidenced by Freeland et al. (hereinafter "Freeland", US2003/0028380).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate sending to a mobile phone in Pintsov's method in order for the recipient to receive the email message.

6. Claims 5-6, 22-23, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pintsov in view of Feinleib.

As per claims 5, 6, 22-23, 25, Pintsov does not explicitly disclose a method as in Claim 1, wherein said Internet appliance comprises a personal digital assistant. However, the use and advantages for using a pda is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Feinleib (column 1, lines 25-35).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate sending to a personal digital assistant in Pintsov's method in order to receive email messages.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N Burgess whose telephone number is (703) 305-3366. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

Art Unit: 2157

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Ettinene can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Barbara N Burgess
Examiner
Art Unit 2157



MOUSTAFA M. MEKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER